



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,024	12/10/2003	Hee Tae Lim	0465-1113P	5176

2292 7590 10/02/2006

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH  
PO BOX 747  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

RIGGLEMAN, JASON PAUL

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1746

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/731,024

Applicant(s)

LIM, HEE TAE

Examiner

Jason P. Riggleman

Art Unit

1746

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 December 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show part number label "5" as described in the paragraph [0005] of the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

Art Unit: 1746

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract exceeds the 150-word maximum length. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monteiro et al. (US Patent No. 6311527) and in view of Yoon (US Patent Publication No. US 2004/0035155 A1).

7. Monteiro et al. teaches a dual-drum washing machine wherein the first drum is installed within the second drum (Fig. 9), and the drum can be seated within a tank (Column 1, Lines 50-60). The drums can rotate independently and the drums can be rotated at different speeds/directions (Column 2, Lines 12-18) by the use of two motors (one or both can be used for washing) (Column 5, Lines 0-5). The motors rotate the drums by driving a set of pulleys and drive belts (Column 6, Lines 7-21) each connected to the inner or outer drum, respectively. After rinsing, one motor rotates drums unidirectionally, at the same speed to dewater the articles. Rotating member 46 functions as a sun gear which engages with a plurality of planetary gears, 38 and 42, (toothed wheels) (Column 5, Lines 48-63) rotating the outer drum.

8. Monteiro et al. does not teach a rotational plate ganging shafts of planetary gears nor an inner gear case housing sun and planetary gears with teeth formed on an inner circumferential surface; however, Yoon teaches a rotational force transmission device,

housed in an inner cylindrical gear case, from a pair of shafts to a pair of drums (paragraphs [0018] –[0020]). An outer drum shaft is connected to an outer drum and an inner drum. The inner drive shaft rotates a sun gear, which is integrated into the shaft, and rotates the inner drum by direct connection. The outer drum is rotated by the action of the sun gear upon the planetary gears whereby the inner circumference is toothed for engagement of the outer drive shaft which is connected to the outer drum.

9. Yoon does not teach a second shaft extending from a center of a rotational plate ganging shafts of planetary gears which connects to the inner drum, and instead, extends the inner drive shaft to directly connect to the inner drum; however, the planetary gears are present in Yoon, in the same location in the gear case with the same function. It has been held that an obvious choice in design would have been obvious (*In re Kuhle* 188, USPQ 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the inner drive shaft of Yoon to terminate at the sun gear and to connect the inner drum to a second shaft from a rotational plate ganging shafts of the planetary gears to make an effective means for controlling the rotation of the drums.

10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Montiero et. al with Yoon to create a dual-motor dual drum washing machine that has effective means to drive the rotation of the drums.

11. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monteiro et al. (US Patent No. 6311527) and Yoon (US Patent Publication No. US 2004/0035155 A1), as applied to claims 1-2 above, and further in view of Imai (US Patent No. 6257027).

Art Unit: 1746

12. Monteiro et al. and Yoon do not teach the use of induction motors; however, Imai teaches a full automatic washing machine with dual motors – one washing motor and one dehydrating motor. In a preferred form, Imai teaches using an induction washing motor (Column 2, Lines 5-64). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Monteiro et al. and Yoon with drives containing an induction motor for either the washing motor, dehydrating motor, or both to create an efficiently controlled drum-type washing machine.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason P. Riggleman whose telephone number is 571-272-5935. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on 571-272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jason P Riggleman  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1746

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Michael Barr', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

**MICHAEL BARR**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**